

**Remarks**

After entry of this Amendment, the pending claims are claims 13-18, and 20-24. The Office Action dated April 30, 2008 has been carefully considered. Claims 13, 14, 16-18, and 20-24 have been amended. Claim 19 has been cancelled. Support for the amendments to claims 13, 14, 16-18, and 20-24 are found in the specification, as well as in the figures. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the above Amendment and following Remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated April 30, 2008, the Examiner:

- Objected to informalities in the abstract and in paragraphs 44 and 71;
- Rejected claims 13-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention;
- Rejected claims 13-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 00/48138 to Bell et al.

**OBJECTED SPECIFICATION**

The informalities in line 12 of the abstract, paragraph 0044 and paragraph 0071 have been removed. The first portion of the abstract has been deleted to remove the informality 'succAn." Paragraph 0044 line "X<sub>f</sub> win occur" has been amended to read "X<sub>f</sub> will occur." Paragraph 0071 line 7 "as t" has been amended to read "as it." Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the specification.

**REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Applicants have amended claims 13-24 to remove the term "relatively." By deleting "relatively" the claims are no longer indefinite under 36 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 13-18 and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

**REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B)**

Claim 13

Independent claims 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 00/48138 to Bell et al. According to the Examiner, Bell discloses all of the claimed elements of claim 13. Applicants respectfully submit that Bell does not teach every limitation of independent claim 1 as amended.

Claim 13 is amended to define the processor configuration as being "operable to control a gate for directing coins towards an accept path or a reject path." Support for this amendment is found in the description at page 10, first paragraph, with reference to Figure 1. This limitation links the processor configuration to a change that takes place in a structural element of the device, showing that the processor actually controls the device rather than just generating signals.

Amended claim 13 further includes limitations to define the outputs provided by the processor as being provided to the gate in order to direct money items towards the accept path or the reject path. When the parameter of a second money item is compared with the restricted acceptance range, both outcomes are now defined, including providing "an output to the gate to direct the second money item towards the reject path when the second occurrence of the parameter signal falls outside said restricted acceptance range." When the parameter signal corresponding to a second money item is compared with data corresponding to said internal security range, both outcomes are now also defined, including providing "an output to the gate to

direct the second money item towards the reject path when the second occurrence of the parameter signal falls within said internal security range."

Applicants respectfully submit that Bell does not anticipate claim 13 as amended. Bell teaches an arrangement in which the detection of a suspect money item having a parameter occurring within a low probability region of a predetermined distribution triggers the use of a restricted acceptance window to determine the acceptability of subsequent money items. Money items having parameters falling within the restricted acceptance window are always accepted.

In contrast, claim 13 provides an internal security range, in addition to the high and low probability regions mechanism used in Bell, outside of which coin parameters must fall in order for them to be accepted. The internal security range operates in a very specific manner and is designed to detect a particular type of fraud caused by good counterfeit money item. When such item is inserted into the money acceptor, a Gaussian output with a narrow peak inside even the restricted acceptance window (RAW) is produced. Because such particularly good counterfeit money items are not often encountered, the internal security range is only used when it transpires that the money item gives rise to a parameter within the internal security range of values (UI SB, LISB) within the high acceptance probability region, i.e. selectively in a situation where the restricted acceptance range will not provide adequate discrimination. However, even when the internal security range testing is not used, the restricted acceptance range (RAW) testing may be used to deal with the quality of frauds more regularly encountered. This way, the rejection rate is optimized for frauds of different quality, without unduly increasing the overall rejection rate for true money items.

It is therefore submitted that Bell does not anticipate amended claim 13 because it does

not teach a money item acceptor comprising: a signal source to produce a money item parameter signal as a function of a sensed characteristic of a money item, a store to provide data corresponding to a normal acceptance range of values of the parameter signal for a money item of a particular denomination, the range including-high and low acceptance probability regions wherein the value of a parameter signal corresponds to a high or low probability of an occurrence of a sensed money item of said particular denomination, and a processor configuration operable to control a gate for directing money items towards an accept path or a reject path, the processor configuration further configured, to determine when an occurrence of the parameter signal falls within the low acceptance probability region, and in response thereto, to compare the value of a subsequent occurrence of the parameter signal corresponding to a second money item with data corresponding to a restricted acceptance range as compared with the normal acceptance range, and to provide an output to the gate to direct the second money item towards the accept path when the second occurrence of the parameter signal falls within said restricted acceptance range, and to provide an output to the gate to direct the second money item towards the reject path when the second occurrence of the parameter signal falls outside said restricted acceptance range, said processor configuration being further configured to determine when an occurrence of the parameter signal corresponding to a first money item falls within an internal security range of values within said high acceptance probability region for a money item of a particular denomination, and in response thereto, to compare the value of a subsequent occurrence of the parameter signal corresponding to a second money item with data corresponding to said internal security range, and to provide an output to the gate to direct the second money item toward the accept path when the second occurrence of the parameter signal falls outside said internal

security range, and to provide an output to the gate to direct the second money item towards the reject path when the second occurrence of the parameter signal falls within said internal security range.

Moreover, as claims 14-18 and 20-24 all directly or indirectly depend from amended claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are equally allowable. Withdrawal of rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of claims 14-18 and 20-24 are also respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

The Commission is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 15-0665, Order No. 020305-004002.

Respectfully submitted,  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: September 2, 2008

By: /Rita H. Lin/  
Attorney name Rita H. Lin  
Reg. No. 61,623

**MAILING ADDRESS**  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP  
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600  
Irvine, CA 92614-2558  
Tel. (949) 567-6700  
Fax. (949) 567-6710